One more point, I think, is necessary to state here; and that is the "form mediums" for those external responses. In our Hindoo philosophy all modes of expression are resolved into two very simple generalisations that explain their manifestation, namely **Nama** and "Rupa", i.e. name and form. For every idea, they say, there must be a "Name", i.e. its verbal concomitant, as well as a **Rupa", i.e. its concomitant in form, before it could make itself felt and understood. Now the question may arise whether the external responses 1 have referred to, accepting them as the dual reflection of my own self, made themselves manifest through my own or another form. If it was another, then the question will naturally arise,— Howf should the response that is not making itself felt through my own form be called a reflection of my own self in external nature?

The question indeed appears very puzzling. I shall, however, try to explain matters as best as I can. Though I must admit that the forms that appeared to reflect or respond to

the thoughts
that arose in my mind were not as a
rule the
very prototypes of my own form, yet
we have
but little or no reason to doubt the
propriety